


identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

**PUBLIC COPY**

U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
20 Mass. Ave., N.W., Rm. A3042  
Washington, DC 20529



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services



FILE:




Office: WASHINGTON, D.C.

Date: OCT 20 2004

IN RE:

Obligor:


Bonded Alien



IMMIGRATION BOND:

Bond Conditioned for the Delivery of an Alien under Section 103 of the  
Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1103

ON BEHALF OF OBLIGOR:



INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All documents have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

Robert P. Wiemann, Director  
Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The delivery bond in this matter was declared breached by the District Director, Washington, D.C., and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The record indicates that on April 3, 2002, the obligor posted a \$3,500 bond conditioned for the delivery of the above referenced alien. A Notice to Deliver Alien (Form I-340) dated November 1, 2002, was sent to the obligor via certified mail, return receipt requested. The notice demanded the bonded alien's surrender into the custody of an officer of the Immigration and Naturalization Service (legacy INS), now Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), at 10:30 a.m. on November 21, 2002, at [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] The obligor failed to present the alien, and the alien failed to appear as required. On November 22, 2002, the district director informed the obligor that the delivery bond had been breached.

In order to properly file an appeal, the regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(2)(i) provides that the affected party must file the complete appeal within 30 days after service of the unfavorable decision. If the decision was mailed, the appeal must be filed within 33 days. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.5a(b).

The record indicates that the district director issued the Notice-Immigration Bond Breached on November 22, 2002. It is noted that the district director properly gave notice to the obligor that it had 33 days to file the appeal. Although counsel dated the appeal December 20, 2002, it was received by ICE on December 29, 2002, or 37 days after the decision was issued. Accordingly, the appeal was untimely filed.

It is noted that counsel asserts that the breach notice was not postmarked until December 2, 2002. Counsel, however, provides no evidence to support his argument. The assertion of counsel does not constitute evidence. *Matter of Laureano*, 19 I&N Dec. 1, 3 (BIA 1983); *Matter of Obaigbena*, 19 I&N Dec. 533, 534 (BIA 1988); *Matter of Ramirez-Sanchez*, 17 I&N Dec. 503, 506 (BIA 1980).

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(2)(v)(B)(2) states that, if an untimely appeal meets the requirements of a motion to reopen or a motion to reconsider, the appeal must be treated as a motion, and a decision must be made on the merits of the case. The official having jurisdiction over a motion is the official who made the last decision in the proceeding, in this case the district director. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(ii). The district director declined to treat the late appeal as a motion and forwarded the matter to the AAO.

As the appeal was untimely filed, the appeal must be rejected.

**ORDER:** The appeal is rejected.